

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 8:24-cv-01362-DOC-KES

Date: July 2, 2024

Title: RHONDA JOHNSON PAWNELL V. LUCIAN GRAINGE ET AL.

PRESENT:

THE HONORABLE DAVID O. CARTER, JUDGE

Karlen Dubon
Courtroom Clerk

Not Present
Court Reporter

ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR PLAINTIFF:
None Present

ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR DEFENDANT:
None Present

**PROCEEDINGS (IN CHAMBERS): ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE
DISMISSAL FOR LACK OF
SUBJECT MATTER
JURISDICTION**

Plaintiff Rhonda Pawnell’s complaint alleges federal question as its jurisdictional basis. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1331. However, this allegation appears improper because Plaintiff cites no federal statute, treaty, or provision under which her action arises. Under federal question basis for jurisdiction, Plaintiff’s complaint states: “The basis of the court is all parties are represented by one Label UMG/UMPG. After submitting prior measures for the Defendants to respond. None have rectified the situation.” Compl. at 3. The Complaint goes on to allege that Defendants have wrongfully withheld royalties from Plaintiff. *Id.* at 4. The Court cannot determine from these allegations any distinct federal question contained in the complaint.

Additionally, the complaint does not clearly allege diversity jurisdiction. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1332. However, as Ms. Pawnell filled in portions of the complaint relating to diversity jurisdiction, the exercise of diversity jurisdiction would be improper because, according to the complaint, all plaintiffs are not diverse from all defendants. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1332; *see also Strawbridge v. Curtiss*, 7 U.S. (3 Cranch) 267 (1806). Here, both Plaintiff Rhonda Johnson Pawnell and Defendant Sir Lucian Grainge are alleged to be citizens of California.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 8:24-cv-01362-DOC-KES

Date: July 2, 2024
Page 2

Accordingly, the Court orders Plaintiff(s) to show cause in writing within ten (10) days of the date of this order why this action should not be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Defendant(s) may submit a response in the same time period. An amended complaint correcting the deficiencies will be deemed a sufficient response to this order to show cause.

The Clerk shall serve this minute order on all parties to the action.

MINUTES FORM 11
CIVIL-GEN

Initials of Deputy Clerk: kdu